

Serial No. 09/575,749

Page 7

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 8, 14, and 15 are amended and claims 18 and 19 are added. Claims 1, 14, and 15 are amended to clarify granting access to said personal data in either said first data storage device or said second data storage device by a third device only when said first and second data storage devices are operatively coupled together. Claims 1 and 8 are also amended to correct minor typographical errors which do not affect the scope of the claims. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects, under 35 U.S.C. § 102, claims 1-17 over Storck et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,434,395). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference" (MPEP §2131, citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)).

Applicants assert that Storck et al. does not disclose or suggest granting access to a third device to said personal data in either said first data storage device or said second data storage device only when said first and second data storage devices are operatively coupled together, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 14.

In particular, Storck et al. uses an interfacing circuit that controls data transfer between one data carrier and another data carrier when the data carriers are identified as compatible. There is no disclosure of granting access to said personal data in either said first data storage device or said second data storage device to a third device only when said first and second data storage devices are operatively coupled together and such is not asserted by the Office Action.

Applicants also assert that Storck et al. does not disclose or suggest second personal data storage device storing a substantially duplicate copy of a first set of user data stored in a first personal data storage device, whereby user data in either said first or second personal data storage device is accessible and usable only when said first and second personal data storage devices are in communication with each other as recited in independent claim 8.

Storck et al. uses an interfacing circuit that controls data transfer between one data carrier and another data carrier when the data carriers are identified as compatible (Abstract).

Serial No. 09/575,749

Page 8

First of all, Storck et al. does not disclose that data in either said first or second personal data storage device is accessible and usable only when said first and second personal data storage devices are in communication with each other. In particular, Storck et al. discloses controlling data transfer between data carriers when they are identified as compatible with each other. For example, there is no disclosure that the data is not accessible and usable when two specific carriers are not in communication with each other. In particular, Storck et al. expressly discloses that transactions can be carried out between several microcircuit cards (col. 4, lines 31-34). Thus, Storck et al. does not disclose that data in either said first or second personal data storage device is accessible and usable only when said first and second personal data storage devices are in communication with each other, as recited in independent claim 8.

Furthermore, Storck et al. does not disclose that each carrier having a duplicate copy of data where data is accessible and usable only when the carriers are in communication with each other. In particular, Storck et al. is directed to an interfacing circuit for controlling data transfer between the two carriers, which is the opposite of each carrier having a duplicate copy of data where data is accessible and usable only when the carriers are in communication with each other (Abstract). In particular, if each carrier in Storck et al. had a duplicate copy of data, it would be unnecessary to use an interfacing circuit to control data transfer between the carriers. Thus, Storck et al. does not disclose that each carrier having a duplicate copy of data where data is accessible and usable only when the carriers are in communication with each other, as recited in independent claim 8.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 8, and 14 define patentable subject matter. The remaining claims are either not rejected or depend from the independent claims and therefore also define patentable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Serial No. 09/575,749

Page 9

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-19 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any fees arising as a result of this Amendment or any other communication from or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,



Matthew C. Loppnow
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 45,314

Dated: March 4, 2004

Phone No. (847) 523-2585
Fax No. (847) 523-2350

Please send correspondence to:
Motorola, Inc.
Intellectual Property
600 North U.S. Highway 45
Libertyville, IL 60048